

REMARKS

This paper is filed in response to a *Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment* that was issued in this case on August 27, 2010, in response to a non-compliant amendment filed on October 19, 2009. This paper is intended to be a complete substitute for the non-compliant amendment. Please disregard all changes to the claims and remarks that were made in the non-compliant amendment.

At present, claims 1-14 and 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable over U.S. Publication 2003/0072451 to Pimentel in view of U.S. Patent 6,336,137 to Lee.

Responsive to the rejection, claims 1, 6-13, 16, 18, and 20-21 have been amended. Support for the amendment can be found on page 16, line 12, claim 17, as originally filed, and elsewhere in the specification.

The applicants respectfully submit that the application in its amended form is in condition for allowance.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejection of Claims 1-14 and 16-22

Claim 1-14 and 16-22 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103 as being unpatentable Pimentel view of Lee. The applicants respectfully submit that the amendments to the claims overcome the rejection.

Claim 1, as amended, recites:

1. A method:

generating push content in a server, responsive to information received in the server from an enterprise application, wherein

(i) the push content is delivered from the server to a client device over a wireless network,

(ii) the push content comprises an embedded uniform resource identifier (URI) that identifies information, and

(iii) ***the uniform resource identifier (URI) is embedded in the push content such that the uniform resource identifier (URI) is invisible to users of the client device; and***

receiving in the server from the client device, responsive to the push content that comprises the uniform resource identifier (URI), a request for the information that is identified by the uniform resource identifier (URI);

wherein the request initiates a pull operation that pulls the information that is identified by the uniform resource identifier (URI) and displays the information that is identified by the uniform resource identifier (URI) on the client device.

(emphasis added)

Neither Pimentel nor Lee teach or suggest, alone or in combination, what claim 1 recites — namely, receiving push content from a server, wherein the push content comprises a uniform resource identifier (URI) that is invisible to users of the client device.

For example, in accordance with claim 1, when a user wants to obtain some information from an enterprise application, the user will be provided with push content that contains a URI. The URI is made invisible to the user. Responsive to the push-content, the user's client device will request and obtain the information referenced by the embedded URI. In this way, content that is identified by the URI is downloaded seamlessly to the user's device.

Advantages of the present invention are discussed in the specification on page 14, lines 5-10:

*Such a client-originated request for additional information initiates a WAP pull operation that pulls the multimedia content, WAP application or other information from the content generator 136 of the WSS and displays it on the mobile client device. The illustrative embodiment thus seamlessly couples WAP push and WAP pull operations. This is advantageously accomplished in a manner that not only makes the transport model **transparent to users**, but also facilitates a server-centric architecture by eliminating any need for a corresponding client application running on the mobile client device. The latter advantage makes the application platform device-independent and suitable for use with any type of WAP-enabled terminal.*

In other words, the present invention provides a transport model that is transparent (*i.e.*, invisible) to the users. The transport model eliminates the need for a user's device to run a server-specific application in order for it to receive content from the server.

The Office acknowledged that Pimentel fails to teach an arrangement where the push content comprises a uniform resource identifier (URI) and cited Lee as teaching this

limitation. The applicants respectfully, submit that claim 1, as amended, overcomes the teachings of Lee.

Claim 1 was amended to recite that the URI is invisible to users of the mobile device. Lee, in contrast, fails to mention that the URL is invisible. In fact Lee implies that the URL is visible because, in Lee the "mobile user can select the URL in the alert and send a response." (See Lee at column 12, line 66 — column 13, line 1.)

Moreover, the URLs in Lee do not reference information that is delivered upon a request for information that is responsive to the push-content. Rather, Lee discloses that the URLs are used by the user to make further requests:

*The server is configured to read data embedded in header responses, for example, where the server is configured to embed information included in one or more of URIs, URLs, or URNs in the server responses, and where the **client is configured to use the one or more of URIs, URLs, or URNs to submit further requests to the server.***

In one embodiment, the server interprets an early request from a client as a persistent preference for language, protocol, or syntax, and stores this preference, using the stored preference to retrieve the language, protocol, or syntax preference of the client from the dictionary or other cache.

For example, the server may create a state description or session for the client during an early request from the client, and thereafter associate a particular language, protocol, or syntax with the session, and maintain the session in expectation of receiving later requests from the client. The embedded information identifies the session, thereby identifying the client's preferred language, protocol, or syntax.

As described above the server may be a multi-tiered server system, comprising multiple programs and where the various are distributed among the different tiers of the system.

(See Lee at column 10, lines 1-20.)

The cited passage discloses that the URIs are submitted to make requests, such as a request for a "persistent preference for language, protocol, or syntax." The URLs are not used by the client device to obtain information. In claim 1, in contrast, the URI is used by the client device to obtain information.

Similarly, at column 12, line 67 – column 13, line 1, Lee discloses that the URLs are *used to send a response or transmit a status update*. In claim 1, in contrast, the URI is used by the client device to obtain information.

Stated succinctly, Lee and Pimentel do *not* teach or suggest that the URLs are used by the mobile device to obtain information. Furthermore Lee and Pimentel fail to teach or suggest that the URLs are invisible.

For these reasons, the applicants respectfully submit that claim 1 is allowable over the combination of Pimentel and Lee.

Because claims 2-14, 16, and 18-20 depend on claim 1, they are likewise allowable. The recitation of additional features in them provides further grounds for their patentability.

For the same reasons as for claim 1, the applicants submit that independent claim 21 is also allowable over the combination of Lee and Pimentel.

Claims 15, 17, and 22 have been canceled.

Request for Reconsideration Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.111

Having responded to each and every ground for objection and rejection in the last Office action, applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the instant application pursuant to 37 CFR 1.111 and request that the Examiner allow all of the pending claims and pass the application to issue.

If there are remaining issues, the applicants respectfully request that Examiner telephone the applicants' attorney so that those issues can be resolved as quickly as possible.

Respectfully,
Chou et al.

By /Kiril Dimov/
Kiril Dimov
Reg. No. 60490
732-578-0103 x215

DeMont & Breyer, L.L.C.
Suite 250
100 Commons Way
Holmdel, NJ 07733
United States of America